1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 * * * 4 5 D. JAMES HADEL, et al., Case No.: 2:06-cv-01032-RLH-RJJ Plaintiffs, SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER 6 7 (Motion to Consolidate-#266) VS. 8 WILLIS ROOF CONSULTING, INC., et al., 9 Defendants. 10 11 Earlier today, February 7, 2011, the Court inadvertently issued an order (#275) on 12 Defendants' **Motion to Consolidate** (#266) before Defendants had the opportunity to file a reply. Defendants have now filed a reply (#276). The Court has considered Defendants reply and finds 13 14 no reason to change its previous order (#275). Moreover, it appears from the reply that one of 15 Defendants' purposes in seeking to consolidate the cases was to avoid Plaintiffs' efforts to remand 16 the Second Lawsuit. A desire to avoid remand is not a proper basis on which to consolidate. 17 Accordingly, and for good cause appearing, 18 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court's Order (#275), entered on February 7, 19 2011, is the correct and final order for Defendants' Motion to Consolidate (#266). 20 Dated: February 7, 2011 21 Chief United States District Judge 22 23 24 25 26

AO 72 (Rev. 8/82)